

Alan E. Wisotsky (SBN 68051)  
Dirk DeGenna (SBN 188972)  
LAW OFFICES OF ALAN E. WISOTSKY  
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 1500  
Oxnard, California 93036  
Tel: (805) 278-0920  
Fax: (805) 278-0289  
E-mail: lawyers@wisotskylaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants CITY OF OXNARD,  
OXNARD POLICE DEPARTMENT, JOHN CROMBACH,  
and ANDREW SALINAS

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MARIA LAZOS, et al.,	)	No. CV 08-02987 RGK (SHx)
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	[consolidated w/
	)	No. CV 08-05153 RGK (SH)]
v.	)	
	)	
CITY OF OXNARD, et al.,	)	<b>DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO</b>
	)	<b>PLAINTIFF MARIA LAZOS'S</b>
Defendants.	)	<b>MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 11;</b>
	)	<b>DECLARATION OF DEFENSE</b>
	)	<b>COUNSEL</b>
	)	
	)	Date : August 11, 2009
AND CONSOLIDATED ACTION.	)	Time : 9:00 a.m.
	)	Ctrm : 850 Roybal
	)	

Defendants hereby oppose plaintiff Maria Lazos's Motion in  
Limine No. 11 regarding exclusion of expert testimony as to Andrew  
Salinas's suffering from PTSD.

**I.**

**PLAINTIFF FAILED TO TIMELY MEET AND CONFER AS**  
**REQUIRED BY LOCAL RULE 7-3**

Plaintiff failed to timely meet and confer. Pursuant to Local  
Rule 7-3, counsel contemplating the filing of any motion shall  
first contact opposing counsel to discuss thoroughly the substance

1 of the contemplated motion at least twenty (20) days prior to the  
2 filing of the motion. Pursuant to the Court's standing orders,  
3 motions in limine are to be filed and served a minimum of forty-  
4 five (45) days prior to the scheduled trial date of August 11,  
5 2009, which is June 27, 2009. Since June 27 is a Saturday, the  
6 motion is to be filed by June 26. Based upon a June 26 filing  
7 date, any meet and confer effort would have to be completed by  
8 June 6, 2009 (twenty days prior). Plaintiff did not attempt to  
9 meet and confer by identifying the anticipated motions in limine  
10 until June 11, 2009 (Exhibit A). As such, the motion in limine is  
11 untimely and should not be considered by the Court.

12 II.

13 NO EXPERT TESTIMONY IS OFFERED TO BOLSTER  
14 ANDREW SALINAS'S CREDIBILITY FOR PURPOSES OF  
15 EXPLAINING HIS ALLEGED VARYING ACCOUNTS

16 Plaintiff Lazos filed her motion to exclude opinions from  
17 defendants' experts regarding the credibility and/or rationale for  
18 differing accounts of the incident without advising the Court as to  
19 what are the alleged differing accounts. The plaintiff is asking  
20 the Court to decide the issue blind.

21 The case of *Westcott v. Crinklaw, et al.*, 68 F.3d 1073 (1995),  
22 is not actually on point as plaintiff alleges. In this civil action  
23 against a police officer for use of excessive force, the court held  
24 that a defense expert's testimony that the officer suffered from  
25 post-traumatic stress syndrome following the shooting of plain-  
26 tiff's husband, **for purposes of explaining the officer's varying**  
27 **accounts of the incident**, impermissibly bolstered the officer's  
28 credibility, since reliability of the officer's statements was a

1 credibility issue which should have been left in the exclusive  
2 province of the jury.

3 As indicated above, plaintiff failed to advise the Court of  
4 Andrew Salinas's alleged different versions of what occurred. To  
5 the defense's knowledge, there are no variances in Sgt. Salinas's  
6 testimony as to what occurred. It is expected that Dr. Lewinski  
7 will explain why police officers, when involved in high-stress  
8 encounters such as the one facing Sgt. Salinas, often miss vast  
9 quantities of information while they are scanning and focusing.  
10 Several witnesses claim that they heard a voice say words to the  
11 effect of "Don't shoot me" immediately prior to the gunshots;  
12 however, Sgt. Salinas testified that he did not hear any such  
13 statement. Sgt. Salinas has not offered varying accounts on this  
14 issue, a significant distinction, and that is how this case differs  
15 from *Westcott*.

16 Plaintiff will argue that having heard the statement,  
17 Sgt. Salinas should have realized that the decedent did not pose a  
18 threat to him and, as such, the force was not reasonable.  
19 Dr. Lewinski's studies demonstrate why such a statement, if in fact  
20 made, was not heard by Sgt. Salinas. The testimony is not offered  
21 to bolster his credibility to counter varying accounts from the  
22 same witness.

23 / / /

24 / / /

25 / / /

26 / / /

27 / / /

28 / / /

1 For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that  
2 the Court deny plaintiff Maria Lazos's Motion in Limine No. 11.

3  
4 Dated: July \_\_\_\_, 2009

5 LAW OFFICES OF ALAN E. WISOTSKY

6  
7 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
8 DIRK DeGENNA  
9 Attorneys for Defendants,  
10 CITY OF OXNARD, OXNARD POLICE  
11 DEPARTMENT, JOHN CROMBACH, and  
12 ANDREW SALINAS  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**DECLARATION OF DIRK DEGENNA**

I, Dirk DeGenna, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney admitted to practice law before all the courts of the State of California and the United States District Court, Central District of California, and am an associate in the Law Offices of Alan E. Wisotsky, attorneys of record for defendants in this action. I make this declaration of my own personal knowledge, except as to the information declared on information and belief, and if called upon to testify, I could and would do so competently.

2. Plaintiffs' counsel did not make an effort to meet and confer regarding potential motions in limine until June 11, 2009, when by way of correspondence dated that same day, plaintiffs' counsel identified 23 anticipated motions in limine.

3. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the June 11, 2009, correspondence.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July \_\_\_\_, 2009, at Oxnard, California.

---

DIRK DEGENNA